

## **REMARKS**

No claims have been amended. No claims have been canceled. Claims 1-28 remain pending in this application.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's acceptance of the substitute specification and replacement drawing sheets submitted in the previous office action response on April 4, 2005.

### **35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 24 and 26 - 28 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. 6,405,252 (Gupta '252) in view of Raz et al. US2000/0037400 (Raz '400). The Examiner stated that "Gupta fails to specifically teach compressed version of static information related to the web page." The Applicant agrees with this assessment of Gupta et al. '252.

As in the January 4, 2005 office action, the Examiner repeats the argument on page 7 that:

it is known that wireless communication devices and Web or proxy servers use compressed web pages wherein, in response to a request for a Web page, a first portion of the requested Web content is static so as to be independent of the response received from network sites a second portion of the content is dynamic so as to be determined by the response from the network site.

The Applicant respectfully continues to object to the characterization of what is known and unknown in the art without providing foundation for such a statement based on evidence. As previously stated by the Applicant, the Applicant respectfully requests that such evidence be provided or this unsubstantiated objection about compression be withdrawn.

In an alternative argument, the Examiner cited Raz '400 with particular reference to paragraphs [0035], [0042], [0052], and [0071]-[0075]. The Examiner stated that Raz '400 teaches a method for streaming static web pages to the client where the pages transmitted are compressed for transmission and subsequently cached in local memory. The Applicant agrees with this characterization as far as it goes. However, the Applicant respectfully points out that Raz '400 is describing the manipulation of

entire/complete static web pages in its streaming manager. The present invention as claimed is manipulating discrete elements of, rather than, entire or complete web pages that are either static or dynamic in nature. Further, Raz '400 does not teach storing compressed pages in a cache, but rather only receives compressed pages.

Furthermore, Raz '400 actually teaches away from the present invention by teaching that the streaming manager decompresses the web pages (see for example paragraph [0042]).

Thus, Raz '400 fails to teach splitting individual web pages into static and dynamic information as presently claimed. In addition, Raz '400 fails to teach, as claimed in present claim 1, 7, 12 and 17, compressing the static information in a cache and serving that compressed static information from the cache to a user in response to a request for a web page.

In view of the foregoing, Raz '400 alone, or in combination with Gupta et al. '252, fails to teach the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 7, 12 and 17.

Claims 2-6 and 26 depend from claim 1 and therefore are allowable over Gupta et al. '252 and Raz '400 for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 8-11 and 27 depend from claim 7 and therefore are allowable over Gupta et al. '252 and Raz '400 for the same reasons that claim 7 is allowable. Claims 13-15 and 28 depend from claim 12 and therefore are allowable over Gupta et al. '252 and Raz '400 for the same reasons that claim 12 is allowable. Claims 18-25 depend from claim 17 and therefore are allowable over Gupta et al. '252 and Raz '400 for the same reasons that claim 17 is allowable.

The Examiner references Hawkins with respect to claims 22-24, but fails to identify if this is the same reference from the prior office action. Nonetheless, claims 22-24 from claim 17 and therefore are allowable over Gupta et al. '252 and Hawkins for the same reasons that claim 17 is allowable

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-24, and 26-28 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. '252 in view of Raz '400 should be withdrawn, because

Gupta et al. '252 and Raz '400 fail to teach all elements of the present invention as claimed.

Claims 4 and 25 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta '252 in view of Raz '400, and further in view of Jungck 6,728,785 (Jungck '785). Jungck '785, like Gupta et al. '252 and Hawkins et al. '318 fails to teach all elements of the present invention as claimed. In particular, Jungck '785 does not teach, as presently claimed in independent claims 1 and 17, the storage of compressed information including static elements of a web page in a cache of a web server and subsequently serving the compressed static information from the cache to a user in response to a request for the web page. Claims 4 and 25 depend from independent claims 1 and 17, respectively, and therefore are allowable over Gupta et al. '252, Raz '400, and Jungck '785 for the same reasons that claims 1 and 17 are allowable. Thus, the rejection of claims 4 and 25 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. '252 in view of Raz '400 and further in view of Jungck '785, should be withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims 1-28 are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

DIGITAL RIVER, INC.

By agent:

North Oaks Patent Agency  
45 Island Road  
North Oaks, Minnesota 55127  
(612) 850-1688

Date: 7 January 2006

By   
Shawn B. Dempster, Registration No. 34,321